

EXHIBIT 1

FILED UNDER SEAL

In the Matter Of:

FAIR ISAAC CORPORATION

vs

FEDERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, et al.

HENRY MIROLYUZ

January 11, 2019

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 10</p> <p>1 this as efficiently as possible and as respectfully to</p> <p>2 the witness as possible.</p> <p>3 MR. HINDERAKER: And Counsel, we will</p> <p>4 be doing the same thing, on some of your upcoming</p> <p>5 noticed depositions, designating those witnesses</p> <p>6 for some topics, and I'll asking for the same</p> <p>7 courtesies.</p> <p>8 MR. FLEMING: I understand your</p> <p>9 position. This is the second day that</p> <p>10 Mr. Mirollyuz has appeared for a deposition, at</p> <p>11 great inconvenience on both occasions. I believe</p> <p>12 you ought to be able to conclude the individual</p> <p>13 deposition and the topics that he's been</p> <p>14 designated for in one day, and we do not have any</p> <p>15 agreement beyond that.</p> <p>16 Q (By Mr. Hinderaker) And I understand,</p> <p>17 Mr. Mirollyuz, you've been designated for three topics?</p> <p>18 A I believe so.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. One of those topics, 15, I was</p> <p>20 advised last night about 8:30 p.m. So if we can in</p> <p>21 the future give a little bit more notice that would be</p> <p>22 appreciated.</p> <p>23 I've had -- the court report has marked this</p> <p>24 as Exhibit 178. You'll see it's a subpoena to</p> <p>25 testify today. Do you understand that you are here to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12</p> <p>1 paycheck. My assumption was I was employed by CHUBB.</p> <p>2 Q CHUBB is a big thing. So my particular</p> <p>3 question is: Were you employed by Ace American</p> <p>4 Insurance Company just before you left?</p> <p>5 A I'm not sure. Again, I do not -- I cannot</p> <p>6 answer your question one way or another. My</p> <p>7 assumption is irrelevant in that case.</p> <p>8 Q Pardon me?</p> <p>9 A My assumption is irrelevant --</p> <p>10 (Court reporter asked for</p> <p>11 clarification.)</p> <p>12 A -- is probably irrelevant in this case. I</p> <p>13 do not know because I haven't looked in my paycheck.</p> <p>14 Q All right. So you don't know one way or the</p> <p>15 other?</p> <p>16 A Yes, exactly.</p> <p>17 Q Who employs you now?</p> <p>18 A Altair Technical Services.</p> <p>19 Q And when did you start that employment?</p> <p>20 A January 1st of 2019.</p> <p>21 Q Do you recall when you moved from your</p> <p>22 position working with Blaze Advisor software to we'll</p> <p>23 call it CHUBB IT Claims?</p> <p>24 A I believe in the beginning of 2015.</p> <p>25 Q Now, the merger between CHUBB and Ace was</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 11</p> <p>1 testify pursuant to subpoena?</p> <p>2 A I do.</p> <p>3 MR. FLEMING: Did you say 158?</p> <p>4 MR. HINDERAKER: I said 178.</p> <p>5 Q This, sir, is Deposition Exhibit 179. Have</p> <p>6 you seen this 30(b)(6) Notice of Deposition before</p> <p>7 this morning?</p> <p>8 A I did.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So just to reaffirm, you intend to</p> <p>10 testify on a 30(b)(6) basis to Topics 15, 16 and 17.</p> <p>11 Is that correct?</p> <p>12 A That is correct.</p> <p>13 Q Thank you. When we last met during a</p> <p>14 30(b)(6) deposition, I asked you for who you were</p> <p>15 employed by at that time. You answered CHUBB, IT</p> <p>16 Claims, and we just go let it go at that and we moved</p> <p>17 on. I'd like to get more clarity at the moment. I</p> <p>18 understand that you've left the employment?</p> <p>19 A Correct.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. At the time you left your employment,</p> <p>21 what was the specific company for whom you were</p> <p>22 working? What was on your paycheck?</p> <p>23 A I believe -- I do not recall, quite frankly.</p> <p>24 I did see my paycheck. I have a direct deposit. So</p> <p>25 quite frankly, I'm never interested what's in the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 2016?</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q And so you think it was a year before the</p> <p>4 merger?</p> <p>5 A A year before, yes. Because of the internal</p> <p>6 reorganization.</p> <p>7 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 180 marked for</p> <p>8 identification.)</p> <p>9 Q As you'll see, Exhibit 180 is a May 21, 2009</p> <p>10 e-mail, and you are on the string of e-mails, so you</p> <p>11 see. It references an EUZ meeting with Henry to work</p> <p>12 on proof of concept to implement Blaze and EEU. Are</p> <p>13 you familiar with that?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q My question to you, sir -- and when we were</p> <p>16 together before, you mentioned that while Blaze</p> <p>17 Advisor had been hosted -- was hosted on servers in</p> <p>18 Canada, CHUBB was in -- big CHUBB was in the process</p> <p>19 of migrating Blaze Advisor and Blaze Advisor</p> <p>20 applications to servers in North Carolina?</p> <p>21 A Correct.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. I'm going to have a similar set of</p> <p>23 questions with respect to Europe and the UK. Could</p> <p>24 the European CHUBB company benefit -- use Blaze</p> <p>25 Advisor applications for the sale of insurance</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 policies in Europe with those applications and Blaze</p> <p>2 Advisor hosted in the United States?</p> <p>3 A I do not have this information.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. So technically, you don't know the</p> <p>5 answer to that one way or the other?</p> <p>6 A Yes, exactly.</p> <p>7 Q In this e-mail, then, Russell Hodey reports</p> <p>8 that they'd like to do a proof of concept to prove the</p> <p>9 usage and implementation of Blaze over in the EUZ. So</p> <p>10 to run the proof of concept they had to install Blaze</p> <p>11 Advisor in the UK.</p> <p>12 A They could or could not. It doesn't</p> <p>13 necessarily mean that it physically was installed in</p> <p>14 the UK.</p> <p>15 Q You don't know one way or the other?</p> <p>16 A I don't know one way or another.</p> <p>17 Q All right. It could have been installed</p> <p>18 only in the United States and had Blaze Advisor</p> <p>19 applications in the UK?</p> <p>20 A Used by UK but installed in the United</p> <p>21 States. It could have been.</p> <p>22 Q Technically that's possible?</p> <p>23 A Technically it's possible. Was it there or</p> <p>24 not? I cannot tell you.</p> <p>25 Q Whether they did or not, I understand. But</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 identification.)</p> <p>2 Q Mr. Mirolyuz, do you recognize this as an</p> <p>3 e-mail dated May 28, 2009 that you received from</p> <p>4 Russell Hodey?</p> <p>5 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>6 Q Do you conclude from this document that</p> <p>7 Blaze Advisor was installed in Europe?</p> <p>8 A I do not.</p> <p>9 Q Do you know one way or the other?</p> <p>10 A I don't.</p> <p>11 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 183 marked for</p> <p>12 identification.)</p> <p>13 MR. HINDERAKER: Counsel, you'll have</p> <p>14 to look over his shoulder. I don't have a second</p> <p>15 copy for some reason. I have many copies of the</p> <p>16 second page but not the first page.</p> <p>17 Q Do you recognize this as an e-mail dated</p> <p>18 November -- Exhibit 183. Do you have it, sir?</p> <p>19 MR. FLEMING: Just one second.</p> <p>20 Q Do you recognize Exhibit 183 as an e-mail of</p> <p>21 dated November 5, 2009 between yourself -- well, from</p> <p>22 Craig Thompson?</p> <p>23 A I do not because I don't believe I'm on this</p> <p>24 e-mail.</p> <p>25 Q I'm not suggesting that you are. Do you see</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 technically it is possible?</p> <p>2 A Correct.</p> <p>3 Q And their e-mail concludes that this</p> <p>4 obviously depends on us being able to use the</p> <p>5 Enterprise license agreement for all elements of</p> <p>6 Blaze. Henry said he will confirm this shortly.</p> <p>7 Do you recall following up on that?</p> <p>8 A I did not follow -- I follow up with Patrick</p> <p>9 Sullivan, who was the chief architect at that time at</p> <p>10 CHUBB. And as you can see on that e-mail, he</p> <p>11 confirmed that we have unlimited licenses.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. What he says is, "We have unlimited</p> <p>13 developer licenses."</p> <p>14 A Correct.</p> <p>15 Q Did you have any conversations with anyone</p> <p>16 with respect to the geographic scope of the license?</p> <p>17 A No, I did not.</p> <p>18 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 181 marked for</p> <p>19 identification.)</p> <p>20 Q Mr. Mirolyuz, do you recognize 181 as an</p> <p>21 e-mail you received from Russell Hodey around May 22,</p> <p>22 2009?</p> <p>23 A I do.</p> <p>24 Q Thank you.</p> <p>25 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 182 marked for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 that this an e-mail November 5, 2009 from Craig</p> <p>2 Thompson to a number of people?</p> <p>3 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>4 Q All right. And I'm just going to ask you</p> <p>5 for your understanding of what it might mean. You see</p> <p>6 it says, "Can either of you answer which version of</p> <p>7 Blaze you're running on?"</p> <p>8 Let me back up. Do you know who Stuart</p> <p>9 Fisher is?</p> <p>10 A No. He's somebody in the European zone.</p> <p>11 But who he is, I don't know.</p> <p>12 Q And Russell Hodey is in the European zone as</p> <p>13 well?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q All right. And Craig Thompson, is he --</p> <p>16 where does he come from?</p> <p>17 A He was in United States.</p> <p>18 Q All right. So we have somebody from the</p> <p>19 United States asking folks in Europe, "Can either of</p> <p>20 you answer which version of Blaze you're running on?"</p> <p>21 A Correct.</p> <p>22 Q Understood. The next sentence says, "I</p> <p>23 assume you're running on our infrastructure over</p> <p>24 here." Craig Thompson is saying that.</p> <p>25 I understand you're not on the e-mail. What</p>